

SURVEY RESULTS
LA CRESCENTA-MONTROSE COMMUNITY MEETING - NOVEMBER 13, 2007
FOOTHILL BLVD CSD
71 official attendees, 44 surveys returned

All entries have been recorded verbatim from the surveys. Responses have not been edited.

1) Please mark the box that best describes your affiliation to the community.

25	57%	Residential property owner
1	2%	Residential renter
11	25%	Own commercial space on Foothill Boulevard
3	7%	Lease commercial space on Foothill Boulevard
4	9%	Other: Crescenta Valley Town Council Property owner in the area Own apartment units in area Chamber of Commerce director

2) Were you aware of a proposal for design standards for Foothill Boulevard prior to this meeting?

35	80%	Yes
9	20%	No

3) How satisfied are you with the current look of Foothill Boulevard?

0	0%	Very satisfied
3	7%	Satisfied
3	7%	I could go either way
16	37%	Disappointed
21	49%	Very disappointed

4) If you feel that Foothill Boulevard needs improvement, what kinds of improvements should be focused on through design standards?

- Do away for giant billboards - La Crescenta is only area on Foothill Blvd with these huge signs
- Media, landscaping, architectural styles
- As little as possible if greater spending is required of business owners. Drought tolerant, low-to-no water requirement plants/trees should be standard. La Canada's median strips require traffic blocking maintenance use a lot of precious water.
- A median would DRASTICALLY improve our Foothill Blvd.
- Everything addressed in the CSD is greatly needed and will improve our community.
- Pedestrian-friendly want to shop here. No more big boxes. Look like La Canada.
- Would be great if Foothill would be a continuous strip from La Canada through Sunland!
Artistically blended together!
- Ordinance proposals look great. Also, I would love an attractive median.
- Landscape, signage
- An island in the middle.
- A median strip.
- Readable signage. Pedestrian inviting.

SURVEY RESULTS
LA CRESCENTA-MONTROSE COMMUNITY MEETING - NOVEMBER 13, 2007
FOOTHILL BLVD CSD
71 official attendees, 44 surveys returned

- Signage, landscaping, limit foreign language signage. Exterior architecture that fits into our natural landscape.
- Some conformity in setbacks.
- Cut back on signs, poles gone, good plants, greenery
- Add design elements. Reduce scale of buildings. Reduce signage.
- Limit of repair places. Required English "as well" on signs.
- Billboards gone! Uniformed look! Landscaped medians!
- More green. No billboards. Green median.
- Landscaping with easements. Architectural standards. Signage. Improve facades of existing buildings (cosmetic only).
- Remove all billboards; more landscaping; more uniformity in design. Better design! Landscaped median strip. More aesthetically pleasing building design with indigenous store. Better signage.
- Building height, setbacks, and architectural styles. Landscaping, parking, sign standards, transitions between residential and commercial, streetscape.
- More green. Less automotive. Good sidewalks. No billboards.
- Signage, building design, comfort and feel by pedestrians and motorists.
- Signage, especially huge non-English signage should be eliminated.
- Beautification
- Some minimum architectural or design standards should be provided so that it's not such a hodge podge of buildings.
- Stricter guidelines for the style of the new. Renovate failing.
- Architecture, landscape, signage.
- More landscaping. Buildings with charm building interesting roof lines, benches, fountains, patios and benches. Trees in parking lots. Island in center of boulevard. No billboards.
- Remove illegal signs (without permit). Control number and size of signs. Landscaping. Architectural design. An island in the center of the street would be nice.
- Construction of a center median to promote more green and also discourage left turns.
- Overall improvements on design to conform to the flavor of La Crescenta.
- Adequate parking. Prettier design & additional landscaping.
- Architectural standards. Landscaping.
- Concentrate on the "BLIGHTED" properties and new construction.

5) Do you think that the design standards for Foothill Boulevard as described in the presentation are too restrictive?

6	14%	Too restrictive
1	2%	Restrictive
25	57%	It is balanced
6	14%	Lenient
1	2%	Too lenient
5	11%	No response

SURVEY RESULTS
LA CRESCENTA-MONTROSE COMMUNITY MEETING - NOVEMBER 13, 2007
FOOTHILL BLVD CSD
71 official attendees, 44 surveys returned

6) Would you support the proposed design standards as presented tonight?

28	64%	Yes, adopt them as presented
10	23%	I would adopt them given the following revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Less restrictive setbacks and height limits. More architectural design options. Less parking restrictions. -- I suggest adoption of a minimum of standards with re-evaluation in the future. Traffic flow may require adjustments (parking). -- Make them less onerous. -- Would like to give it more thought. -- After a detailed review of the proposal. -- All signage should conform to one of two styles and restricted size. -- Add some restrictions on driveway approaches and windows and balconies facing residential zones. -- Signage is a problem. -- It would appear that the proposal needs some input & review by the business & commercial property owners.
2	5%	No, I do not support any design standards for Foothill Boulevard
4	9%	No response

7) Other comments:

- I have lived in more than one "planned" community in Orange County and prefer the moderate improvements that business owners initiate on their own. I do not favor the "trendy" look of our newest grocery store on Foothill and found the requirement of a 2 foot box trees, in the draft, excessive/frequently plantings are further restricting possible parking places.
- This is exactly what we need!
- We have a 2000 Cal Poly Pomona survey done 7 years ago that asked for help for Foothill Blvd. 5 years ago the CVTC started the Foothill Design Committee. Tons of time a great accomplishment, let's get it done. Property values will go up as they have done in La Canada.
- Thanks, forge ahead. Let us know how we can help.
- Much needed!
- If necessary, have a design review board. Have more planting along sidewalk.
- A very good plan.
- The committee has done an excellent job.
- Get County to remove existing billboards. Get County/State to put median strip on Foothill.
- It's time to stop polishing the apple to adopt and implement these design standards as soon as possible. You can't satisfy everyone. What is important is what is best for the community. Stress that and spend on making a building look better will pay off for the property owner.
- Have to start somewhere. Consider the cost. Plan long term.

SURVEY RESULTS
LA CRESCENTA-MONTROSE COMMUNITY MEETING - NOVEMBER 13, 2007
FOOTHILL BLVD CSD
71 official attendees, 44 surveys returned

- I think the business owners over residential wishes should be the main concern.
- Thank you for all the hard work. Call on me to help in any way!
- This is long overdue. I'm almost ashamed to try and "locate the town" of La Crescenta.
It could look more like La Canada! Thanks to the committee for years of work!
- Great presentation. I look forward to a more pedestrian friendly Foothill Blvd like
La Canada has. I would like to see buildings that reflect La Crescenta's charm.
I have lived here 30+ years and always shop in La Canada because it's a more
appealing place to be.
- Great work!
- I am very excited at the thought of a beautiful business corridor in La Crescenta on
Foothill Blvd.
- Foothill Blvd is in dire need of improved design. It appears that without guidelines this
will not happen.
- I would like our stretch of La Crescenta Blvd to look as friendly and charming as Carmel,
Santa Barbara or the Village of San Clemente.
- I am glad to see a Community Standards District.
- Have not had time to read through this yet.
- Great job!
- Overnight parking restrictions on Foothill Blvd and other commercial streets. This will reduce the
"used car" look of Foothill.
- Generally I support the proposal, however I feel that more input from the business community
and the commercial property owners would be appropriate. Attached are some
specific comments regarding the proposal:

Page 33: Paragraph E, e, k, ix: Temporary Real Estate Signs.

(2) "twenty four feet in area" Is that linear or square footage?

(5) Signs shall not be displayed more than three times per year on a lot or
parcel of land and shall not be displayed for more than thirty
days at a time."

COMMENT Restriction to 30 days is unreasonable and unrealistic. This is a
restriction on the Property Owner's or an Agent/Broker's ability
to market a commercial property adequately. This restriction
also places an undue financial burden on the Owner/Agent to
remove and replace signage every 30 days and limits exposure
to no more than a 90 day period of exposure. Commercial
property in the La Crescenta Area even in a good market has
taken much longer than 30 days and even 90 days to sell;
sometimes several years. Attached is an example of commercial
properties in the Foothill Area as reflected in our local Multiple
Listing Service (MLS).

Page 35: Paragraph 3,3,k,xv: Non-Conforming Signs.

COMMENT (1) The "ten years" limitation on existing signs is too restrictive
and places an undue financial burden on business and/or
property owners to replace existing signs.

SURVEY RESULTS
LA CRESCENTA-MONTROSE COMMUNITY MEETING - NOVEMBER 13, 2007
FOOTHILL BLVD CSD
71 official attendees, 44 surveys returned

(3) "Fifty Percent" is an arbitrary cut-off on the repair of signage at current prices. Repair to the "face" of a sign could easily exceed the original cost of sign boxes and face. To put a specific percentage limitation on repairs would be too restrictive and unfair to business and/or property owners who are the one's who have to carry the burden. And most of these businesses and property owners will be SMALL business and property owner's not LARGE corporations who have "deep pockets" or unlimited resources.